

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

APR 1 0 1945

DETROIT

Vol. V, No. 5

April 2, 1945

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Christian's Dual Citizenship

THIS Easter season should remind us that the event which we celebrate marked a new beginning in the life of humanity. This is one aspect of Easter that is usually neglected. Our Churches surround the day with symbols of the renewal of nature in the springtime and sermons stress the meaning of the resurrection of Christ for the personal destiny of the individual. Less often do we realize that without the faith of Easter there would be no Christianity, no Christian community. If the Cross had been the end rather than the beginning of the work of Christ, then indeed we would be "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Paul constantly refers to the life that is possible for men because of the death and resurrection of Christ, to the new powers of the spirit that are present, to the new community, to the new creature. The resurrection signalized the victory of Christ over the powers of the world that had held men in bondage, a victory that had actually taken place, a victory by which the life of the Christian in the world is determined.

Today it is easier for many to see the new life in nature or to hope for new life beyond the grave than to be confident that human history took a different course as the result of the resurrection. It is discouraging, at first thought, to be told that the link between us and the resurrection is the Christian Church. But it remains true that a new and decisive factor entered into the life of humanity with the victory of Christ. To this new factor the Church constantly bears witness even though in its own life as an institution it remains so largely unredeemed.

As the result of this new factor, the Christian in 1945 is a citizen of two cities, and as St. Augustine said, these cities "lie confusedly together." We have responsibility as citizens of the nation or the larger political order of humanity to act so that as far as possible, men will be freed from both anarchy and injustice. But what we do as citizens of this larger human city depends upon the alternatives that are politically possible at a given moment. At the same time, as Christians, we have the responsibility to make clear to ourselves and to others exactly where we stand, what the quality of our political choices is and to counteract as far as this can be done the evil in those choices. These two responsibilities are linked "confusedly together." The City of God to which we belong must not be an escape from the City of the World, providing

us with religious satisfaction which undercuts our responsibility to find the next best step that is open to the nation or the community of nations. Within the City of the World we must make decisions and face choices which would be intolerable if our citizenship in the City of God did not give us the sense of God's mercy. Our knowledge that we are both forgiven and empowered by grace enables us to continue the struggle against the evil, both within our opponents and in ourselves.

It is a terrible thing to call evil "good"; but it is also a terrible thing to allow the evil in the best that we can see to do, to defeat that best. How much simpler it would be to live with a clear conscience in the City of God and leave the world to the devil; or to live with a clear conscience in the world by convincing ourselves that what we are about to do will transform it into the City of God. It is the consequence of the victory of Christ and of the new life and the new powers which flow from it, that we cannot do either of these things and that we become capable of this dual citizenship.

The chief practical consequence of the victory of Christ is the creation of an actual community in the world which is constantly judged and renewed by the Gospel. This community is the Christian Church. The Church is not the City of God, but its members are regularly brought under the influence of the City of God. This Christian Church, with all of its weaknesses and sins as an institution and as a human community, is the only school within which people are trained for this dual citizenship. One illustration of this kind of training at this moment is that it is only within the Church that citizens of the United States can be expected to preserve a sense of solidarity with the people of enemy nations. Secular idealism is so controlled by indignation against the crimes committed in the name of Germany and Japan and so preoccupied with the satisfactions of victory that it is incapable not only of the grace of forgiveness but even of the wisdom of discrimination between those most responsible and those least responsible for the crimes. Within the Church there is both resistance to the callousness that no longer notices the multitudes of innocent victims in Tokyo or Berlin and readiness to be reunited with the German and Japanese who have maintained their Christian integrity.

J. C. B.

Episcopalian-Presbyterian Unity Negotiations

THEODORE O. WEDEL

THE General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1937 issued an invitation to the Presbyterian Church (Northern) to confer with a view to achieving "organic union." The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church cordially accepted the invitation. Commissions of the two Churches have been in almost continuous negotiation ever since.

What has been accomplished? Officially, nothing, except motions to continue. Behind the scenes, however, a great deal has happened. Tentative schemes have seen print and been subjected to debate. In the Episcopal Church, the debate has, indeed, been volatile. The Episcopalian Commission presented a report to the General Convention in Cleveland in 1943. This contained a tentative scheme of union—called, not too happily, "Basic Principles"—as thus far worked out by the representatives of the two Churches. A majority of the Episcopalian Commission (12 out of 15 members), though not presenting the scheme as a finished product, were prepared to ask for a vote of confidence, and accompanied "Basic Principles" with a frank argument in behalf of the direction in which it plainly points. A minority report presented arguments against acceptance. The Convention did not permit the issue to come to a vote. Instead, the Commission, with some change in membership, was simply ordered "to continue." The vote, disappointing as it was to a large group within the Episcopal Church may have been wise. The first sketch of a plan of union needs much elaboration and clarification. A vote then can be fully informed.

The Presbyterian Church, all along in the negotiations, waited upon prior action by the other Church. Hence it, too, has contented itself with motions of continuance. Elaboration of the tentative plan of union is now in process. When next it emerges from the conference chambers, it may have grown from a document of three pages to a sizable pamphlet. The latest edition of the Scheme of Church Union in South India contains the result of a generation of conferring. Decisions of acceptance or rejection by the Church bodies involved have had to wait until the plan could be envisaged as a concrete whole.

The document called "Basic Principles," which is the tentative precipitate of six years of negotiations, cannot be reprinted here. It may some day be historic, since it offers at least a clue to the solving of the chief riddle of ecumenical ecclesiology—namely, the crossing of the gulf between Catholic Church order and the newer Church orderings which emerged at the Reformation. If once this gulf is crossed, so an Episcopalian would feel at least, there need be no ultimate limit to the organic reuniting of non-Roman Christendom.

"Basic Principles"—I am citing from its last official issue—begins as follows: "The type of unity envisaged in these proposals allows for much diversity of organi-

zation and worship. Unity would be 'organic' in the same way as churches of separate geographical areas, yet of variant organization and worship, were one in the early Church. The two Churches which have developed distinctive traditions or types of witness, worship, and organization during the four centuries of their separated histories, would each preserve its tradition. But the traditions or types would be associated in the United Church and enrich each other." The plan proceeds to make amalgamation concrete. The Historic Episcopate is to be accepted by the Presbyterian Church. The Ruling eldership and the Presbytery are, in turn, to be accepted by the Episcopal Church. How these traditionally variant forms of Church life can be intermeshed in a new whole presents, of course, many intricate problems. An instance of amalgamation, however, is the agreement on ministerial ordinations. This reads as follows: "The ordaining of presbyters or priests, and the making of deacons or licentiates, shall be by the Bishop and the Presbyters of the presbytery of jurisdiction, who shall join in the laying on of hands. Consecration to the episcopate shall be by at least three bishops, and by the electing presbytery which shall participate in the laying on of hands through presbyters appointed by the presbytery." Here, in terms of an ancient cultus, is a uniting of two traditions. The United Church would offer the members of either tradition surprises, yes, but also the preservation of its own sacred forms.

Not all of the solutions of merging will be as neatly comprehensive as this. The plan of union, indeed, has barely begun to wrestle with such items of variant Church life and order as the diaconate, Confirmation, liturgical freedom as over against uniformity, or the problems of Church government. A tentative Constitution is still in the womb of time. Nor has the question of mutual recognition of ministries received an answer. This may turn out to be the chief stumbling-block to union—as it has been in all previous attempts in which one of the Anglican churches has shared. A scheme of "supplemental ordination" may prove acceptable. One tentative scheme was once part of an earlier plan of union, but has been temporarily shelved. It is possible, again, that mutual recognition without a sacramental rite may be the best way out, as in the proposed plan for South India. Either way, grave difficulties lie ahead. For the problem of recognition is fundamental to the problem of union.

Members of churches which have not retained the historic Episcopal Church order probably find the debates on this subject unintelligible, or, at least, very puzzling. Why should Anglicans, let alone Roman Catholics or Eastern Orthodox, refuse recognition to Protestant ministries? Granted that the historic episcopate has been lost in these ministries; surely the spiritual life of the Church cannot depend upon an

ordination formula. The Reformation revolted not only against the Papacy, but against the whole theory of sacerdotal monopoly of grace. Anglicans, in bringing the historic episcopate into a union scheme, appear to be reintroducing sacerdotalism. Against episcopacy as such, even the historic episcopate, Protestant conscience does not necessarily revolt. Many Protestant Churches are reintroducing into their church politics a functional episcopate. Superintendents or moderators are taking on the coloring of "bishops." Methodism already lives under a pragmatic episcopal polity which is far more "monarchical" than any episcopate known to Anglicanism. Protestant conscience revolts against episcopacy only when it lays claims to being a necessity in Church life, upon which the efficacy of the sacraments, for example, literally depends. The Council of Trent so declares for Rome. On the eucharist, it bluntly says: "This sacrament no one can effect, unless a priest who has been duly ordained, according to the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ himself granted to the apostles and their successors." The historic episcopate has here been subsumed under a dogma of Apostolic Succession.

This Catholic view of the ministry and the sacraments is the real issue underlying any reunion negotiations in which Anglicanism shares. From the point of view of a Reformation Church like the Presbyterian such a view is, of course, quite unacceptable. If it is asked to accept the historic episcopate—against which it has no ultimate dogmatic opposition—it has to receive clear guarantees that the Romanist theory is not thereby accepted also. And no guarantee is likely to prove satisfactory short of unmistakable recognition of the Presbyterian ministry *before* union or concomitant with union.

The Episcopal Church, in its turn, is faced with an equally embarrassing doctrinal dilemma. This is, however, very complex.

Anglicanism, as everyone knows, retained at the Reformation, Catholic Church order. But it left doctrinal explanation of what it was doing ambiguous. There is no doctrinal definition of episcopacy in Anglican Church formularies—none at least that remotely approaches the dogmas of Rome. On confessional matters, Anglicanism can, in general, be described as reverently agnostic. It leaves wide scope for variant interpretation. In practice it has been almost as severe as Rome and Eastern Orthodoxy in limiting sacramental ministration to an episcopally ordained priesthood. Does this severity fall merely under the category of discipline or under the category of doctrine? No clear answer is possible. Certainly the main stream of Anglicanism down to the Oxford Movement can be called generous in its interpretation of its retention of Catholic Church order. It has not presumed to pronounce upon other orderings.

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, however, when Anglo-catholicism as we know it today took its rise, a party within Anglicanism has reasserted the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in an uncompromising form. It is this party which finds in the negotiations with the Presbyterian Church a great difficulty of conscience. It cannot deny that episcopacy is preserved pragmatically in the plan of union as thus far crystal-

lized. Nor can it assert that Anglicans themselves are committed to a rigorist view of the ministry like that of the Council of Trent. But it sees clearly that episcopacy, in the plan of union, will have to be defined so as to leave a rigorist view of Apostolic Succession at best merely permissive as a private opinion. Defining the doctrinal ambiguity and explicitly allowing for liberty of interpretation robs the Catholic, so he argues, of his past freedom to teach the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as a "Church" doctrine. The point may be hard to make clear, but it is crucial for the Anglo-catholic. (See T. S. Eliot's brilliant exposition of it in *Reunion by Destruction*.) It is as if Rome were to admit a Protestant view of the ministry *on a par* with that of Trent. Present Anglican formularies, by being silent on *any* doctrinal view, permit the dogma of Apostolic Succession to be taught as undefined dogma. This would be no longer possible in the United Church. Furthermore—here the issue becomes clear even to an outsider—any recognition of a non-episcopal ministry would also force the yielding of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as a necessity for Christian Faith.

A very real tension, consequently, has been precipitated within the Episcopal Church by the unity issue. Protestant churchmen may be tempted to belittle that issue. Yet one can beg them to exercise patience and understanding. Surely the Catholic tradition in Christianity must be granted some status in the ecumenical dream. Anglicanism has preserved Catholic Church order. It should not be asked to surrender this treasure of tradition without careful thought.

Many Anglicans like myself believe that Catholic Church order can be both preserved and made acceptable to Protestant conscience. To us the tentative plan of union looks hopeful. Episcopacy is preserved. Sacred trusts of Presbyterianism are also preserved. Ways are possible of according full recognition to the Presbyterian ministry, yet grafting it into the more complex episcopal ordering. Even the Anglo-Catholic should have his full rights in a United Church.

The clue to a resolution of the tension in the Episcopal Church and a consequent bridging of the chasm between Catholic and Protestant theories of the ministry may consist in the rediscovery of the doctrine of the Church and of the related doctrine of the Holy Spirit. These have slumbered long in Christian tradition. Above all, the connection between the two doctrines has not been fully realized. The Protestant has been tempted to limit the Holy Spirit's work to the individual soul. ("The Spirit in an individual," says Frederick Denison Maurice, "is a fearful contradiction.") The Church as the Body of Christ in which the Spirit dwells, the Church as the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit, has come a long way. The Catholic, in turn, has permitted a sacerdotal hierarchy to monopolize the powers of the Holy Spirit. These powers, in terms of sacramental grace, have become subject to legal manipulation. The Church has been belittled in both traditions. In neither does one see the Church of Apostolic days, a growing Spirit-filled community, in which the Spirit ruled in a corporate united Body of Christ.

"It is the living body," says William Temple, "which gives authority to its Orders; it is not the possession

of valid Orders which gives authority to the body." Is it possible that a fresh understanding of the power of the Holy Spirit and of the many different ways in which that power can operate might be vouchsafed to men in our time? If so, two divergent traditions, such as the Presbyterian and the Episcopalian (with others joining in?) might, being convinced that Church unity is the will of God, humble themselves enough to trust the corporate Spirit once more. First steps toward

unity might be taken, and the Holy Spirit, not bound by the individualistic imprisonment of Protestantism nor the sacerdotal imprisonment of Catholicism, but freed to operate creatively, might bring about a Pentecostal event. The sacred forms of the Church's historic past—episcopate, presbytery, priesthood, sacraments—might become functional and alive once more. A people of God might reassemble on God's holy mount prepared to do battle against the Prince of this world.

The Church and the Soldier's Sex Problem

WILLIAM A. SPURRIER

YOU do not have to be a Freudian to know that one of the biggest problems of young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four is the problem of sex. And while the problem is difficult enough in normal times, it is extremely complex in war time. It is not a comforting thought to know that the majority* of the soldiers of this war who will return home will have had sexual intercourse before marriage. The virgins will be few, and even among these men you will find sexual maladjustment by the very fact that they have practiced an unhealthy repression. Add to this the general moral let-down which always follows a war and it is easy to see that the problem will get more difficult after the war. And yet in spite of this condition, I can see little, if any, evidence that the Church is intelligently aware of the problem—much less doing anything about it.

If the Church is to meet the needs of the soldiers both now and when they return, it had better get down to business. If the Church cannot bring religious insight and motivation to the problem of sex, it cannot really reach the personality of a soldier. If it has nothing to say to him on this problem, he will pay very little attention to what the Church says on any problem. Let's look at the situation as it appears in two areas.

First, the relation of the Church to the soldier now in the army. What is the soldier's problem? His problem runs something like this: He is in an all male society undergoing terrific emotional and mental tensions. His life is regimented down to the last detail—day and night. His outlets for individual self-expression are few and his outlets for sexual emotions are fewer. Wine, women and movies are the three chief avenues for expression and release. And movies—being what they are, are more emotionally stimulating than releasing. Add to these facts, the condition that most of the conversation in barracks and elsewhere concerns sex and you have a problem not faced in civilian life.

Here then is a soldier, who let us say, is in doubt as to what to do about his sexual and emotional drives. In the few hours of free time after arduous and terrify-

ing work, he is ready for almost anything. What to do? Most of his friends know what they are going to do and talk about it with considerable gusto—as if it were the obvious thing to do! But the soldier hesitates. He has been told that intercourse is a sin. But he has been told also that war is a sin, that killing is a sin, that drinking is a sin, that regimentation is a sin, that this and that is a sin. In fact, almost everything he does in the army, at one time or another in his upbringing he has been told that these were wrong. But now he has to do them and nobody tells him these things are wrong—except sex. It doesn't follow, and so he gives in. "A fellow has got to have release, or he'll go crazy," says one. "It's the natural thing to do," says another—and so it goes. This then is the soldier's problem. With almost everything about him and inside of him prompting him to abandon Christian moral standards, how can he withstand these temptations?

Thus far the Church, through its literature and chaplains has given him two answers. The first answer has been silent indifference. This has been a kind of fearful hope that if sex isn't mentioned, the soldier won't think about it. This incredibly naive answer needs no comment. The second answer the Church has given is the familiar moralistic one, namely, that sex is a sin along with drinking and swearing. Accordingly, soldiers receive many pamphlets and lectures which tell them to be good boys, pure and holy, and that by taking thought upon the virtues of virginity, they will hold fast. This chummy advice is as naive as the answer of silence, and actually more harmful because it is in effect, an invitation to indulge in sexual malpractices. It is an invitation first because no man ever wants to be "a good boy" *per se*, and secondly because such advice is only one more "regulation" in a life full of regulations. For a soldier whose ego feels cramped by discipline and is longing for self-expression and individuality another "don't" makes him rebel. He dare not break army rules, for the punishment is immediate and severe, but he does dare to break a moral rule because the punishment is less obvious and less severe and the very element of dare is particularly attractive at this point.

The futility and actual harm of the moralistic approach to sex is thus abundantly demonstrated in the army, as elsewhere. Let the Church therefore, dispense with this prattle. It is still true that "out of the

* Obviously, no figures are available on this point. "Majority" can mean anything from 51% to 99%. Medics and psychiatrists, with whom I have consulted, agree that a conservative estimate would be 80%; that is, of unmarried returning soldiers, 80% would be non-virgins.

heart cometh good and evil," that you cannot master the temptations of sex with all its emotional conflicts merely by subscribing to a few rules. They only increase the tension between what a soldier *feels* like doing and what he *knows* he ought not to do. I think it fair to say that thus far the Church has failed to minister to the soldier's problem of sex while he is in the army.

What about the second area—the soldier returning home? At first, his problem of sexual adjustment will not be apparent—either to him or to anyone else. The thrill of returning home, the freedom from fear and battle strain, the release from a regulated life will be an intoxicating and joyous experience. But soon, he will have to settle down to the business of making a living and all the responsibilities and tensions that it involves. Then his problem will appear again. When anxieties and problems arise, he will be tempted to solve them as before—by seeking sexual excitement and release. In his relationship with women, he will have to make some decisions and some new emotional adjustments. Will he regard women merely as a means to his own satisfactions? Or will he try to hold two contradictory ideas—one, of looking for the ideal wife, but two, meanwhile using any woman that comes along? Or will he make a satisfactory adjustment and settle down to a happily married life? And if so, how can he do this?

What is the Church doing about this part of the problem? I am not sufficiently in touch with the home front to make an accurate statement, but judging from its past action and its present attitude, I would surmise that the Church is still sticking to its two answers: silent indifference and moralism. Of course, there are notable exceptions to this both in the Church at home and the Church in the army. But on the whole, I would guess that the Church is remiss in ministering to the sexual problems of the returning soldier.

Thus far we have tried to analyze the situation. Our task now is to reconstruct. What can and ought the Church to do in ministering to the sex problems of the soldier now and when he comes home?

First, and obviously, the Church must become aware of the problem. In becoming aware of it, the Church must not become afraid of the problem to the extent of acting frantically and desperately. American youth will not become sexual degenerates, the army does not run a vast house of prostitution and the post-war world will not see American womanhood debauched. I say this because sometimes when Church folk—leaders and laymen alike—first discover a real problem which existed long before their eyes were opened, they often try to make up for lost time and overcome their guilty feelings by hysterical activity which only makes the problem worse. The Church's record on drinking and the war are but two examples. The Church must become aware of the problem in the sense of responsible concern and resolute action. This means that it must spend time in reviewing the historic insights of our religion on the matter of sex, of re-examining the Church's attitudes, teachings, and methods of approaching the problem, of weeding out the false elements here, strengthening the true elements there, of consulting with psychiatrists and doctors in order to gain their

insights and criticisms, of reading, and discussing and praying. The Church must do this individually and collectively in order to find out what the Christian view of sex is and how it may be taught. Unless we know whereof we speak, we are helpless.

Now this is not easy. For most of us, it will mean considerable time, effort, and study. But harder than that, it will mean that most of us will have to give up some quaint but long-cherished notions about sex, and it will mean perhaps, considerable friction between members of the Church. These last two items are stumbling blocks to many fine intentions. Nevertheless, they must be risked.

Secondly, in ministering to the men in the army, ministers and chaplains must talk straight from the shoulder. The army requires the chaplain to give a thirty-minute sex lecture at least once every six months. This is an excellent opportunity even if only an introductory one. But there are countless other chances to follow up such a talk. In these situations the Church must educate itself and its chaplains to be realistic as well as idealistic. We must tell the men *everything*, and in *detail*. As a part of a man's understanding and religious approach to his sex problems, he must know the biological and the psychological details as well as the religious aspects. Therefore, the chaplain must be able to discuss and bring religious insights to bear upon the components of intercourse, masturbation, exhibitionism, repression, release, tensions and some of their causes, etc. We must talk frankly about these things. If a soldier says he sees no harm in intercourse, if properly protected, we must not raise a self-righteous eyebrow. We must first agree with him that, if properly protected, the chances of any physical infection are indeed very remote. And before we go on to point out possible psychological or spiritual harm, we had better talk about what is involved in terms of satisfaction in intercourse. What makes for satisfaction?—because that is what he wants. What of the various factors involved—the motive and emotional drive behind the desire for intercourse?—is it a pathological one, is it an egotistical one, is it an escapist attempt? What do these factors do to one's satisfaction? What does the element of love and marriage add to the act? What is the price of various courses of action and is the price worth it? etc., etc. These are the types of questions which the Church and its leaders must ask and be prepared to answer. In short, problems of sex will not be solved by moralistic rules or high ideals. They will be solved only if first the soldier's psychological conflicts are resolved, and second, when he is motivated by religious ideals and emotions. To be sure, we cannot be psychiatrists who can readily handle the first problem, but we can be sufficiently informed to spot such conflicts when we see them. Our primary job is to provide religious motivations and drives and this we can do only if we get down to the bed rock of a man's personality and meet him where he is. Such is the approach of the chaplain to his men, as I see it.

Thirdly, the Church in its literature to the soldiers might well do a number of pamphlets on sex. Soldiers do read pamphlets, but most of them aren't worth

reading precisely because they are moralistic and often irrelevant. They preach down at a soldier, they try to shout him into the Kingdom. The Protestant Church could learn much from the Catholic Church on pamphlets. They are very readable, usually done in story form, or informal chats with Father —. Realistic, informal and frank pamphlets on sex would help immensely. There is a big field open here.

Fourthly, the Church at home must continue this sort of work when the soldier returns. There should be classes conducted by a doctor, a psychiatrist, and the minister. These must be carefully planned and worked out by the three leaders. There should be forums, discussion groups, lectures—yes, sermons on the problem of sex. These should not be limited to just the soldiers or to high school age people, but open to all from fourteen to forty. This means several types of classes and approaches, namely, that of an adolescent group, college age, pre-marital, post-marital, ex-soldier groups.

Another method of meeting the problem is through the drama. This has tremendous possibilities. There is much room for creative play writing along lines of a religious approach to sex. And all young people love to act and produce a play. Such a drama would do more to present the problem, make people aware of it, declare that the church proposes to face it, than a thousand pamphlets. I submit that this sort of thing would be far more helpful to the Church than whist parties, "suppers," bingo games, bazaars, and incidentally, if we must mention it, would raise more money!

Of course, such a plan would arouse considerable opposition—as will all plans to meet the problem of sex. Some will believe that the minister is trying to "degrade the morals of our youth" and others will say he is "trying to turn the church into a burlesque house." This is to be expected and each minister must make his decision and act upon it with considerable tact and win confidence by making it perfectly clear beforehand what he is trying to do. It is simply another instance in the ministry where our Lord counsels us to be "wise as serpents and gentle as doves."

Among its youth groups and conferences, the Church has made a good start in meeting the problem of sex. There is much room for improvement, as most youth leaders know. More realism in the sense of getting away from a too-simple answer treatment is necessary, as is more cooperation with medical authorities. The increasing friendship and meeting of minds between ministers and psychiatrists is an excellent sign. Perhaps the greatest need is to have these youth conferences backed up by the local churches—which, after all, are the only ones who can meet a person's problem in detail and carry it through to a successful conclusion.

So much for suggestions—they are only a few designed to indicate the direction of work. What is important is the urgent necessity for the Church to become aware of the problems, re-examine its theology and ethics of sex and get to work. There is much to be done and vast opportunities await us—our response is long overdue.

"I Was Hungry"

President Roosevelt suggested on March 16th that though America would not go hungry it might be necessary to "tighten our belt" if we were to fulfill our obligations to a starving Europe. On the same day a group of British Christians petitioned their government to establish an even more rigorous rationing system for the sake of offering greater aid to the hungry people of Europe.

The President was tentative in his suggestion because he is conscious of an increasing tendency in certain sections of our population to discourage aid to the poorer nations. We are afraid of being "Santa Claus." The very ease of American life in wartime tends to make us more, rather than less, complacent toward the claims of other nations. We were the only nation engaged in the war which did not seriously decrease its living standards. We merely added a wartime production of 80 billion dollars to the peacetime production of 100 billions. We have had food rationing, of course, of a very mild sort. But that was necessary, not to make food available to other nations, but to insure an equitable distribution among our own citizens who were capable of buying more than ever before. Despite meat rationing, for instance, we consumed 147 pounds of meat per person last year in comparison with 136 pounds in the best pre-war year. We are consuming 3,367 calories of food per person per day in comparison with the 1,900 calories which French urban dwellers receive and the 700 calories which constitute the daily ration of Greeks. We are very rich in a poor world and very fat in a lean world.

The contrast between our living standards and those of the rest of the world presents us with one of the great challenges of the hour. As the war draws to a conclusion and the veil is lifted we will see devastation, hunger and desperation on a wider scale than the world has ever witnessed. Something more than relief will of course be required to set the world on the path to sanity and health. But relief will be the first pressing requirement.

The Christian churches of the nation must do all they can to support and to press the government in its politically difficult task of requiring further and even more stringent rationing for the sake of fulfilling even the most minimal obligations to a starving world. If the sense of brotherhood should not prompt us we might well consider that a hungry world will look with jaundiced eyes upon our feasts.

We are in a difficult moral position in regards to this problem because our comparative distance from the scene of suffering and destruction is responsible both for the comforts which we enjoy and for the tendency toward complacency in our response to the claims of a suffering world. Only a very sensitive conscience and a vivid imagination can bridge the chasm between our abundance and the world's needs. We can never bridge this chasm completely, but we must try.

It would be terrible if our nation should come under the judgment: "I was hungry and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; I was sick and in prison and ye visited me not." R. N.

The World Church: News and Notes

Reveal German Chaplains Carried On Anti-Nazi Activity

Resistance of the German Confessional Church to Nazism was carried into the German armed forces through the chaplaincy service, according to information revealed by the Religion Division of the Ministry of Information.

A German war chaplain, who is now an Allied prisoner of war, has been identified by German Confessional representatives in Great Britain as a member of the Church's opposition movement, and as author of a pamphlet in defense of the Jews, which he wrote while serving as a chaplain. He also described the sufferings he and others endured before the war, and how various Confessional pastors had been imprisoned or put to death.

Calling on Christians to take a definite stand against many features of Nazism, he wrote:

"We live in an age no less pervaded by superstitions and devils than were the Middle Ages. Instead of witchmania it is Jewmania which inspires orgies of our allegedly enlightened era. This Jewmania, which was already raging madly in the Middle Ages, has reached the acute stage nowadays.

"The Church must not keep silence. It must not say the settlement of the Jewish problem is a civil matter, and one in which the state is entitled to authority. . . . Nor must the Church say the Jews are now receiving the punishment they desire for their sins. There is no such thing as moderate Christian anti-Semitism, even when it is presented in an illuminating manner with logical national reasons, or even with scientific, or shall we say, pseudo-scientific reasons.

"Witchmania, too, was once given a scientific basis by experts from faculties of theology, law, and medicine. The fight against Judaism comes from the same murky spring as did witchmania. Mankind today has still not outgrown its search for a scapegoat, and therefore it is always searching for all kinds of guilty people, Jews, Freemasons, and powers unanswerable to the state.

"It is therefore necessary for Christianity to make the same decision which the congregations of the Middle Ages made. Instead of searching for a scapegoat, and singing of hatred, it must repent and acknowledge its own guilt. It must exorcise all demons which have invaded our era, with triumphant assurance that Jesus is victor, that everything must be subject to Him, and that He is leading the world on towards His return and His wonderful kingdom." (R.N.S.)

French Assembly Votes to Withdraw Subsidies to Private Schools

The French National Assembly has voted to withdraw subsidies to private schools initiated by the former Vichy regime. The subsidies, amounting to nearly seven million francs, went mainly to Roman Catholic schools under a law permitting aid to schools unable to continue without help.

The decision by the Assembly will become operative on April 1, after it has been ratified in a formal decree by the French Cabinet. Meanwhile, it is anticipated that the Assembly's action will stir up animated debate throughout the country. (R.N.S.)

Bishop Garber Arrives in Algiers To Resume Methodist Work

Bishop Paul Neff Garber has arrived in Algiers to become the first resident Methodist bishop of Europe and North Africa since 1939.

With jurisdiction over annual conferences in Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Madeira Islands, and French North Africa, Bishop Garber will maintain temporary headquarters in Algiers until permitted to enter Geneva, Switzerland, where he will have his official residence.

An immediate assignment of Bishop Garber will be to visit chaplains of his denomination in Europe on behalf of the Methodist Commission on Chaplains.

Methodist work in only one of the 12 countries within his jurisdiction has been unscathed by the war, and Bishop Garber's principal responsibility in post-war years will be to direct Methodist relief and reconstruction activities on the continent.

The Church will work in cooperation with the World Council of Churches, and existing relief organizations on the fields, "closely and in every possible way," Bishop Garber said. (R.N.S.)

Anglo-Catholics Oppose Reunion Moves With Free Churches That Compromise on Doctrine

A vigorous minority within the Church of England is strongly opposed to moves for reunion with Free churches that tend to compromise on doctrine, according to a statement issued by the Council for the Defense of Church Principles, an unofficial body receiving substantial support from the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church.

Already signed by 2,800 ministers in communion with the See of Canterbury, the statement criticized the plan for Christian union in South India and similar schemes as "compromising the essential safeguards of Catholic faith and order."

The signatories declared that such compromises would render the Anglican communion "untrue to its principles," and would lay aside "all hope of future reunion with the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches."

They said any reunion scheme based on compromises "would make no advance toward true unity, but rather would prove a fatal element of disruption throughout the Anglican communion."

The statement asserted that Christian unity does not proceed from acceptance of modes of church government, but from the proclamation of creeds "which ought to be received and believed by all Christians."

(R.N.S.)

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*
JOHN C. BENNETT RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, *Editorial Assistant*

Religious Situation in Greece Reported Good

All religious groups in Greece are looking forward hopefully to the future under the new government headed by General Nicholas Plastiras as premier, with Metropolitan Damaskinos of the Orthodox Church as regent, it was reported by George Syriotis, head of the Greek Ministry of Information in London.

Syriotis expressed the conviction that church and state would remain joined, but added that Metropolitan Damaskinos was a "liberal ecclesiastical statesman without bias against other religious faiths." He pointed out that the churchman had undertaken guardianship of Greek wives of Jews, and of all children of both Jews and Orthodox. (R.N.S.)

Books for Hungry Readers

Readers of *Christianity and Crisis* can put their good books not in active duty to work in a strategic center. The library of the College of Theology, Silliman University, Philippines, is being rebuilt by its many friends. Dean James F. McKinley tells of this opportunity. First shipping space will be given books in good condition, not more than fifteen years old, to be used on reference shelves. Exception to this date range would be non-technical classics in any field of church or ministerial service. Second shipping space will be given books for use in the circulating section of the college library.

Address packages of books to College of Theology, Silliman University, c/o Dr. J. L. Hooper, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich. 650 1-46

Russian Orthodox to Report Reunion Terms At Council of Bishops

Terms of the proposed reunion of the autonomous Russian Orthodox Church of America with the mother Church in Russia will not be disclosed until a council of American bishops is held, Bishop Alexis declared.

Accompanied by the Very Rev. Joseph O. Dzvonchik, Bishop Alexis recently returned from Moscow where he conferred with Patriarch Alexis on proposals to end the 27-year-old separation between the Russian Church in America and the Moscow Patriarchate.

Declaring that the separation started with the revolution in Russia, Bishop Alexis asserted "there has never been a breach between the Orthodox Church here and the mother Church." He said:

"Lack of proper communication due to the revolution brought autonomy to the Church in America. The proposals brought back to America should make possible the reunion not only of the Church in America, but of all Russian Orthodox Churches throughout the world. It should pave the way for a closer understanding with the mother Church." (R.N.S.)

Rome Communist Paper Gives Unusual Publicity to Pope's Address

The Communist newspaper *L'Unita* has given unusual publicity to the Pope's address before delegates of the Christian Workers Association in Italy. Since Vatican activities are rarely recorded in the Communist press, this unprecedented attention to a Papal statement has again stimulated speculation regarding conciliation between the Vatican and Moscow.

Praising the Pope for his speech, which it said "excited great interest among workers," *L'Unita*'s comments were in sharp contrast with recent accusations against Vatican policy in the Moscow press.

The Pope's recognition of the effects of syndical unity were particularly satisfying, *L'Unita* said. It commented "with pleasure" on the fact that the Pontiff quoted from a speech by the Communist leader Di Vittorio at the recent congress in Naples of the General Confederation of Labor. (R.N.S.)

Missionaries Released in the Philippines

The Provost Marshal General has released lists giving the names of missionaries who have been freed in the Philippines by the victories of the American armies. Most of the missionaries were interned in the Santo Tomas and Bilibid Internment Camps. The total number released is 422. An additional group from the Los Banos Internment Camp will be published shortly.

Authors in This Issue

Canon Theodore O. Wedel is Warden of the College of Preachers of the Washington Cathedral and an outstanding authority on ecumenical problems.

William A. Spurrier is a Chaplain in the United States Army. He was formerly Associate Chaplain at Amherst College.